

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated 03/17/2006, the Examiner restricts the claim set as filed into three species: Claims 1-17 (Group I), Claims 18-30 (Group II), and Claims 31-37 (Group III).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement for the reasons set forth in the following paragraphs. Nevertheless, Applicants herein affirmatively elect Group I, Claims 1-17.

Relying on, for example, MPEP § 803 Applicants respectfully assert that the Restriction Requirement is improper because the Examiner, by way of the Office Action, has not shown that a search and examination of the entire application will cause a serious burden to him. Referring, to MPEP § 806.05(c)(I), a serious search burden is “evidenced by separate classification, status, or field of search.”

Applicants assert that all the claims as filed, thus all three Groups as restricted by the Examiner, will not only likely be under the same US Classification, but likely will be under the same US Sub-Classification, whereby searching the entire claim set as filed will not prove overly burdensome.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 1-37 should be recombined for examination purposes, even if no generic claim is found to be allowable, and such recombination is hereby respectfully requested.

SN: 10/820,996

-11-

29759  
ITW-14675

No fee is believed to be due at this time. Should any fee be properly due, or if any refund is due, kindly charge same, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-2130.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions, comments or concerns, at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Nicholas A. Matiash et al

Date: April 13, 2006

By:

  
Eric J. Lalor  
Attorney for Applicants  
(Reg. No. 54,631)

Customer Number: 23482

*Wilhelm Law Service, S.C.*  
100 W. Lawrence St., 3rd Flr.  
Appleton, Wisconsin 54911  
Telephone: 920-831-0100  
Facsimile: 920-831-0101

*restresp.29759.doc*